

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ROY RASHAD WELLS EL,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIRST TECH FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,

Defendant.

Case No. C23-1566 RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) in the above-entitled action. (Dkt. # 1.) In the IFP application, Plaintiff indicates he is not employed and has received no money from any source for the past twelve months, has no money available in cash or accounts, and has monthly expenses of \$0. (*Id.* at 1-2.) Plaintiff provides no other information explaining why he cannot pay court fees and costs. (*See id.* at 2.)

The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed IFP upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigence. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). “To qualify for *in forma pauperis* status, a civil litigant must demonstrate both that the litigant is unable to pay court fees and that the claims he or she seeks to pursue are not frivolous.” *Ogunsalu v. Nair*, 117 F. App’x 522, 523 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 1051 (2005). To meet the first prong of this test, a litigant

1 must show that he “cannot because of his poverty pay or give security for the costs and still be
2 able to provide himself and dependents with the necessities of life.” *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de*
3 *Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948) (internal alterations omitted).

4 Plaintiff’s application omits information necessary for the Court to determine his ability
5 to pay. Plaintiff does not, for example, inform the Court how he pays for food, shelter, or other
6 basic necessities of life.¹ Plaintiff should not, under these circumstances, be authorized to
7 proceed IFP.

8 Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause by **October 27, 2023**, why the Court
9 should not recommend his IFP application be denied. The Clerk is directed to send copies of this
10 Order to Plaintiff and to the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez.

11 Dated this 16th day of October, 2023.

12 

13 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
14 United States Magistrate Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 ¹ Plaintiff’s complaint, concerning denial of a loan application, attaches as an exhibit a July 2023 letter
23 from Defendant with a checklist of principal reasons for credit denial. (*See* dkt. # 1-1 at 5.) The Court
notes the reasons that are *not* checked include: “Income insufficient for amount of credit requested”;
“Unable to verify income”; “Temporary or irregular employment”; and “Unable to verify employment[.]”
(*Id.*)